

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-22, 25-30, 32-51, and 55-60 were pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. Claims 2, 23, 24, 31, and 52-54 were cancelled previously. With this Amendment claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 16, 22, 25, 27, 30, 32, 34-51, and 55-60 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-22, 25-30, 32-51, and 55-60 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 3-15, 18-19, 22, 25-30, 32, 33-44, 47-48, 51, and 55-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nafeh* (U.S. Patent No. 5,343,251) in view of *Shikunami* (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,121).

Claims 16, 20, 21, 45, 49 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nafeh* (U.S. Patent No. 5,343,251) in view of *Shikunami* (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,121) in further view of *Shah-Nazaroff et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,88).

Claims 17 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nafeh* (U.S. Patent No. 5,343,251) in view of *Shikunami* (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,121) in view of *Shah-Nazaroff et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,88) in further view of *Kawara et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,836).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 is directed to a signal-processing apparatus comprising a candidate-detecting unit, a characteristic-extracting unit, and a detecting unit. The candidate-detecting unit receives an input signal part from an input signal in time-divided fashion, and identifies characteristic patterns in a portion of the input signal part indicating the probability that the input signal part is a candidate part. The characteristic-extracting unit extracts characteristic patterns from the input

Response to April 15, 2008 Office Action
Application No. 09/840,939

signal part which alone indicate the probability that the input signal part is the candidate part.

The detecting unit detects whether the input signal part is the candidate part based on the characteristic data extracted by the characteristic-extracting unit.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Nafeh* does not disclose “a characteristic-extracting unit which extracts characteristic patterns from the input signal part which indicate the probability that the input signal part is the candidate part,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Shikunami is directed to an information signal processing apparatus which records/plays-back information signal consisting of image and audio signals onto a recording medium such as a DVD. *Shikunami* discloses that change patterns of video and audio signals are detected, the times of these changes are acquired. (col. 8, lines 16-23.) *Shikunami* then discloses that “detected patterns are compared with patterns which are accumulated in a database, and then the ‘probability of being program’ of each signal is calculated.” (col. 8, lines 23-26.) In other words, in *Shikunami* “the probability calculating portion analyzes the degree of coincidence between these patterns, then evaluates the detected patterns stepwise according to the degree of coincidence, and then calculates the ‘probability of being program (or CM).’” (col. 9, lines 11-26.)

In contrast to *Shikunami*, claim 1 recites that the characteristic patterns from the input signal part alone indicate the probability that the input signal part is the candidate part. Since *Shikunami* discloses in all cases that the “probability of being program (or CM)” is calculated after the detected patterns are compared with the patterns in the database, it does not disclose or even suggest this limitation of claim 1. Therefore, since neither *Nafeh* nor *Shikunami*, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest “a characteristic-extracting unit which extracts characteristic

Response to April 15, 2008 Office Action
Application No. 09/840,939

patterns from the input signal part which alone indicate the probability that the input signal part is the candidate part,” Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of *Nafeh* and *Shikunami*.

For the reasons as recited above, claim 30 is also not rendered obvious by the combination of *Nafeh* and *Shikunami*. All other pending claims depend from claim 1 or claim 30. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-22, 25-30, 32-51, and 55-60 are allowable over the cited art.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 15, 2008

By: David R. Metzger
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000